

**MINUTES  
PARK COMMITTEE  
Wednesday, December 9, 2015  
City Hall, Room 207  
5:30 P.M.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Aldermen Jerry Wiezbiskie, Joseph Moore, Brian Danzinger, and David Nennig

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Dawne Cramer, Dan Ditscheit, James Andersen, Ann Moeller, Rick Jensen, Andy Rosendahl, Ald. Wery, Ald. Steuer, and Ald. Scannell

**Approval of the minutes of the meeting of October 28, 2015**

A motion was made by Ald. Nennig and seconded by Ald. Moore to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 28, 2015. Motion carried.

**Adoption of the Agenda**

A motion was made by Ald. Moore and seconded by Ald. Danzinger to adopt the agenda of the December 9, 2015, Park Committee meeting. Motion carried.

**1. Discussion/Action on the following requests by Ald. Wery regarding Colburn Pool:**

**A. To officially recognize the \$1,000,000 fundraising goal that has been met;**

Ald. Wery has requested that we provide this donors list from the Greater Green Bay Community Foundation to this Committee for verification of fundraising dollars. Staff talked with the Chief Financial Officer who verified the pledged amount. He also indicated some cash has already been collected, and they have signed pledges for all amounts listed on the list. The names do not get on the list unless they are verified pledges. They will start collecting funds after this project is Council-approved.

Ald. Wery thanked the Friends of Colburn Pool for their hard work and dedication the past four years.

Ald. Nennig questioned the total dollar amount of \$913,247.08 as stated on the donors list.

Ald. Wery has a check from the Ho Chunk Tribe for \$100,000 that puts the dollars over the \$1,000,000 fundraising goal.

A motion was made by Ald. Danzinger and seconded by Ald. Nennig to officially recognize that the \$1,000,000 fundraising goal by the Friends of Colburn Pool has been met. Motion carried.

**B. To proceed with the Council-approved pool design that the Friends of Colburn group has in good faith fundraised towards;**

On April 10, 2014, the Park Committee directed staff to seek Requests for Proposals for a pool consultant to develop concepts for Colburn Pool. On July 9, 2014, the Park Committee approved hiring Ramaker & Associates Inc. to provide conceptual designs and a cost estimate. They estimated a cost of \$4,500,000 to construct an Olympic-sized pool with amenities. The concept was already approved at the October 1, 2014, Park Committee and the October 7, 2014, City Council meetings. When we hire a pool engineering consultant, you may want to encourage or welcome any suggestions or minor changes to the current conceptual design to lower staffing and other costs.

A motion was made by Ald. Danzinger and seconded by Ald. Moore to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Ald. Wery has been involved in many meetings over the four years with the Friends group, the neighborhood association, the Park Committee, and City Council. This Olympic-size pool concept that was developed was agreed upon unanimously and therefore is what they would like to proceed with at this time.

Ald. Danzinger asked if the Friends group still had minor changes to the plan or if they were prepared to go forward with the Council-approved plan. Ald. Wery said there may be a few minor changes that the architect could tweak to make it less expensive.

Ald. Danzinger brought up the phasing aspect of the project, such as adding the rental shelter and some landscaping at a later date, and asked if that was still a possibility to minimize cost and keep the plan moving forward. Ald. Wery responded that it is still an option if it helps to move the construction of the main pool along.

Ald. Nennig reminded the Park Committee that some of the contributions will be made in installments; therefore that must be considered when moving forward with construction.

Ald. Danzinger wanted to clarify that the list of donors and their contributions are pledged funds, not funds that have been collected at this time.

Ald. Wiezbiskie questioned how much money has currently been collected. Ald. Wery stated that approximately \$130,000 total has been collected to date.

Ald. Moore commented on the possibility of changes made to the design due to St. Norbert's and Tundra Lodge each building an Olympic-size swimming pool. The Friends group has made it clear they want to move forward with this design and plan, and he supports it. He does have questions on the funding on this pool which will be discussed later.

A motion was made by Ald. Moore and seconded by Ald. Nennig to proceed with the Council-approved pool design that the Friends of Colburn Pool group has fundraised towards. Motion carried.

**C. Proceed with bidding out the architect/engineer, utilizing fundraising dollars for this phase so that no bonding would be necessary;**

The consultant estimate of \$4,500,000 will be a two-year-old estimate by the time we build the pool. Since this time, the City has witnessed approximately a 20% increase in construction costs for all bid projects. We are not certain if we can still build this pool for \$4,500,000. We discussed these concerns with Ramaker, and they have experienced similar increases throughout the state. They would charge an additional \$1,400 to update their estimates using today's dollars. If we add 20% to the \$4,500,000, the new estimated total could be \$5,400,000.

If the City would hire a consultant to complete the engineering documents, we would require that the consultant provide an updated engineering estimate so the City would know the amount needed to bond for in spring of 2016. Ald. Wery is proposing to send out a Request for Proposals immediately and hire the consultant in January 2016. The Friends of Colburn Pool would pay to hire a consultant to complete plans and specifications needed to bid out the project using fundraised dollars. We do not know the exact cost of the pool until we get the engineering estimate. Costs for the consultant usually range between 10-12% of the total project. If the pool comes in at \$5,400,000, the engineering costs could be between \$540,000 and \$648,000, which includes bid documents with plans and specifications, construction documents, and the cost of construction supervision when the pool is built.

Typically the process is we bond for the engineering and construction at the same time. We need to secure funding for the pool first, and that has not happened yet. Bonding for the pool construction would not occur until March or April 2016. If bonding is not approved at that time, the fundraising dollars spent to hire the consultant now would be lost. Before the City would hire a consultant, the fundraising dollars would need to be deposited in the City account to pay the consultant in full.

Ald. Wiezbiskie stated that the pool design is already Council-approved, and the increase in construction cost is due to the time it took to get the pledges.

Ald. Moore said his concern is that the Council approved \$3,500,000 if \$1,000,000 was fundraised by the Friends group. The Council did not approve any additional funds. As construction costs have increased over time, now there is a gap with

dollars approved and dollars needed to go forward. He worries that money will be spent on a consultant, and then bonding might not be approved and Ald. Wery's efforts and fundraised money will be wasted. He would not support using the fundraised dollars for a consultant until the bonding has been decided.

Ald. Nennig explained that this happens for most projects. An estimate is given, and facts on actual costs are only achieved after consulting and engineering is complete. The next step is to move forward to obtain those facts. The project could come out within budget. If it doesn't, we would proceed as in other cases and revisit the project to perhaps make changes to lower costs to stay within budget. We will not know either way until we proceed with the engineering work. If the Park Committee decides to wait on the consultant, the project could be another year behind. Ald. Nennig spoke with the Finance Director, and she suggested receiving bids on the engineering portion and then revisit the discussion after those bids have been received. He would be in favor of splitting the engineering costs between the fundraised dollars and the City. There is a commitment from both the Friends of Colburn Pool and the City to build a pool, even if the scope changes somewhat. He would support going forward with the engineering work.

Ald. Danzinger agrees with Ald. Nennig that the question is whether to start obtaining proposals for engineering. Prices have already increased, and waiting longer adds to those increases. The City does not seem to be at risk by getting quotes at this time. We have an estimate from staff from \$540,000 to \$600,000 for the consultant, and based on pledges from 2015 and even part of 2016, that might not even cover those costs. The City might have to cover a piece of that in any case. The donors should be aware that their funds would be used not only for the construction of the actual pool, but also for engineering and consulting costs associated with the project. He understands Ald. Moore's concern that if this pool would not go through we would be putting those fundraising dollars at risk. I would hope that Ald. Wery would have communicated this to the donors. The next step is to get a clear picture of what the actual costs might be. We have already heard differences in the possible gap, from \$400,000 to \$1,000,000, which is a pretty sizable difference. If the process starts in March, final numbers will not come in until probably July. The pool construction would then be moved to 2017.

Staff responded that a tentative timeline has been created, with proposals going to the Park Committee in January and construction possibly beginning in August 2016 after the pool closes for the season.

Ald. Danzinger stated he feels there is no harm in getting the Request for Proposals out there to see what the architect and engineering will cost us. In every scenario, that process will have to be done.

Ald. Wiezbiskie added that the Public Works Department will also have to be involved, and we are uncertain how our timeline will fit with their projects. So there might be some time lapse there as well.

Ald. Wery commented that the Engineering Department has been behind, but since new staff has been added, he feels they will be able to meet our timeline. The approach is aggressive, but it can be done. He is going to propose that the City uses stadium tax overages in this project as well. The Foundation simply wants to know we are going to build a pool, and once we have come to that consensus, we can collect the funds. There would be approximately \$400,000 of funds available to go towards the consultant costs.

Ald. Wiezbiskie stated that \$400,000 of the potential \$1,000,000 bill is not enough.

Ald. Wery said the total amount would not be due up front. Staff reiterated that and said the consultant would not have to be hired to do the construction supervision at this point. Realistically it could cost between \$400,000 to \$425,000 to begin.

Ald. Wery spoke with Ramaker who feels the cost increase might be closer to 10-15%. We would also like to request in-kind donations be included in the construction contract.

Ald. Moore stated that he would only be supportive of this if we are only approving sending out the RFP with no commitment to fund it.

Ald. Danzinger wanted to clarify that the Park Committee is only considering approval starting the Request for Proposals process, and once the bids come back, the Park Committee will then review the proposals and decide at that time whether to hire a consultant.

A motion was made by Ald. Moore and seconded by Ald. Nennig to open the floor for discussion. Motion carried.

Janet Angus, 1403 Shirley Street – Her property abuts Colburn Park, and she swam in that pool growing up. With all of the money spent downtown, she wonders why the City will not put money towards this pool for the community. J. Angus is also concerned about people fundraising for this pool, donors contributing to the pool, and the fact that the pool might not be built per the concept approved by City Council.

Ald. Moore said he has been against this pool from the beginning due to the bonding.

Ald. Danzinger wanted to clarify that the issue is the investment and borrowing that goes towards the pool. The City has committed \$3,500,000 to the construction of the pool. However, everyone should be aware that there is a disparity between what the City has committed and what actual costs might be. We need to determine where those additional funds are coming from.

Ald. Nennig said the City Council made a commitment in good faith to the Friends of Colburn Pool, and we should reaffirm that. If the costs are higher, then we will have a hard discussion. It might be a small amount or it might be double the cost.

Sometimes we have to scale back projects or look for other funding sources. We need to proceed with the assumption that we are going to build a pool with the commitments made from the Friends of Colburn Pool and the City.

J. Angus said she doesn't trust that the project will go through now. And she refuses to give money to having her name on a building if we can't guarantee that building will be built and her name will be put on it.

Ald. Wiezbiskie asked if she looking for a guarantee.

J. Angus said she is a taxpayer, has had this park and pool in her neighborhood her whole life, and is asking that it remains and that taxpayer money is spent to stabilize her neighborhood.

Debbie Jacques, 1839 S. Oneida Street – She wonders if any thought has been given to keeping the pool the way it is. It would cost much less money, and things would move forward much faster. Do we need an Olympic-size pool or can we just fix or rebuild the one we have?

Ald. Danzinger responded that the entire design and size of the pool are meant to mimic the footprint that is already there now. The current condition of the pool is beyond repair. The pool will need to be redone from the ground up.

D. Jacques is hearing from the neighborhood that they just want the size pool they have, and she can't imagine it would cost \$4,500,000 to rebuild it.

Ald. Danzinger thought perhaps the perception of what is a regular-size pool might differ among residents of the neighborhood. The Park Committee has been told that the neighborhood wants the Olympic-size pool, so that is how we proceeded. Definite consideration was made to generate some revenue with the new pool as well, which is why some modifications were made with the new design.

D. Jacques felt the neighborhood was not given enough information or notice that this was happening. Spending so much money on something that is used four months out of the year is hard to accept.

Ald. Moore explained that the regular-size pool cannot be reconstructed in its original format because whenever you reconstruct anything, you must become ADA-compliant which is why the design would have to change.

D. Jacques questioned if the City could build a smaller pool for \$2,000,000. Staff replied it would depend on the size of the pool and what amenities would be offered. Over the four years, discussions were held on building a splash pad, wading pool, a smaller pool, and then the 50-meter pool. These conversations have occurred to get us to this point.

Ald. Nennig said the consultant presented three options, and the design we ended up with was not the most expensive and also not the cheapest.

Mary Stutleen, 1124 Oregon Street – She would like to go ahead with the Request for Proposals and see what the cost comes out to be. We need a firmer estimate on the pool that was approved. It does not commit us to any size pool.

Ald. Wiezbiskie asked if M. Stutleen was a donor and fundraiser and if she would agree to spend the money necessary to find out if the project is feasible. M. Stutleen replied yes to being a donor and fundraiser. She would not agree to dumping the project if costs are too high due to the current commitment on both ends. Prices will continue to rise as time goes on, therefore we should move forward now.

Ald. Wiezbiskie said he would gamble with the donated money, but he would like to know the opinions of the donors themselves.

M. Stutleen asked if the fundraising could continue, such as with bricks or benches. Staff responded yes.

Ald. Danzinger replied if there is going to be a funding gap, additional fundraising and in-kind donations could help to bridge that gap.

Ryan Batal, 1149 S. Ridge Road – He is the Vice President of the neighborhood association and is concerned about changing sizes of the pool. He supports going for the pool design the Council approved.

Leah Frost, 1665 Patten Street – The City committed to \$3,500,000. The Friends raised \$1,000,000. Let's move forward with the price we had. If we find there is a deficit, we'll cross that bridge when we get there.

Ald. Moore said no contractor is going to do the work unless the money is there. He does not support the bonding for this project due to the annual payments.

Ald. Wery asked that the Committee members think about the donors. They have given freely to this project, and if there are no results with their money, the City will lose future donations from these people.

A motion was made by Ald. Danzinger and seconded by Ald. Nennig to return to regular order of business. Motion carried.

Ald. Wiezbiskie summarized the facts of the situation. We do not have the money right now. Despite what the donors have accomplished, we still need the money to make this work. He agrees with Ald. Moore and does not approve of the City giving any more money to this project above the committed \$3,500,000. Olympic-size pools are being built around the area. The Mayor has not taken the opportunity to offer his ideas on this project. The dollars are not there, and the original need is no longer there as other entities are building these pools. He would like to see a smaller pool in this area. Ald. Wiezbiskie said we have an elected Mayor who is dead set against this project, and we have not had a chance

to hear from him. The Mayor feels neighbors don't want it; the Park Committee is hearing they do. Ald. Wiezbiskie would like to see this go through the bonding stage before donated funds are used that could potentially be lost.

Ald. Moore stated we should take the next step and send out the Request for Proposals. Then the Park Committee will review the proposals.

Ald. Nennig said there could be discussions with the Finance Department in the meantime to see what funding would be available. The City committed to \$3,500,000 to help build the pool. The City and the Friends will have serious discussions if a deficit is found. I don't think that can be addressed tonight. I would agree with the suggestion to proceed with the RFP and bring this back to the Committee for approval and get input from the Finance Director on potential funding sources.

Ald. Danzinger agreed because this would align with the bonding process timeline, and the Friends group is willing to pay to hire the consultant.

Ald. Wiezbiskie asked staff what the timing would be for the RFP. Staff replied that the RFP could be sent out as soon as possible, and it could come back to the Park Committee and City Council in January 2016.

Ald. Wiezbiskie would recommend that the Mayor attend the next meeting to state his opinion on the topic.

Ald. Nennig stated he is hesitant to state in the motion that the engineering is to be funded by the Friends of Colburn Pool until the dollar amount is known.

Ald. Wiezbiskie would like Ald. Wery or the Friends of Colburn Pool to find out from the donors if they agree to fund the engineering knowing that there may be a possibility that the funding for the pool construction might not occur.

Ald. Wery disagreed, stating that there has already been a commitment by the City to install a pool. It might not be the Olympic-sized pool if the budget cannot pay for it. If this project falls apart, the City will have a tough time fundraising for any future project. He stated several of the donors want to donate yet this year so at next week's Council meeting he will be looking for assurances that a pool will be built at Colburn Park before the donations are accepted.

A motion was made by Ald. Nennig and seconded by Ald. Moore to direct staff to proceed with sending out a Request for Proposals to hire a pool engineer, discuss potential funding options with the Finance Director, and bring this back to the Park Committee for review and approval. Motion carried.

#### **D. Accept naming rights donations for pool and amenities.**

Ald. Wiezbiskie recommended that we hold on this because we are not ready to make these decisions yet.



Ald. Danzinger stated that since these donations will be potentially used to fund the engineering costs it might be necessary to approve the naming rights in order to accept the donations.

Ald. Nennig stated that in the action the Council took, the terms of the naming rights were approved and would like to know if these terms were met. Staff reviewed the donors who have requested naming rights and discussed the donated dollar amounts associated with these requests.

Ald. Wiezbiskie would like the final naming proposals to be brought back to the Committee for final approval.

A motion was made by Ald. Danzinger and seconded by Ald. Nennig to accept naming rights donations contingent upon staff working with the donors to finalize the naming, signage, and signage placement and bring this back to the Park Committee for review and approval. Motion carried.

## **2. Discussion/Action on the 2016 Community Development Block Grant park proposals**

On October 1, 2014, the Park Committee approved the 2015 community development funded projects. Included on this list was Perkins Park tennis court replacement. In February 2015, the Planning Department requested we reallocate projects on the list that would possibly not be engineered and bid out in 2015. We recommended switching the Perkins Park tennis court funding to fund other projects. We are now requesting \$150,000 in 2016 Community Development funding and are recommending that the money go towards replacing the Perkins Park tennis courts.

Ald. Moore asked if staff could email the park project list to the Committee members so he can get back to a constituent on where their project ranks. Staff said yes.

A motion was made by Ald. Moore and seconded by Ald. Nennig to approve the staff recommendation for the 2016 Community Development Block Grant proposal and forward this request to the Redevelopment Authority for approval. Motion carried.

## **3. Report of the Purchasing Manager**

### **A. Request approval to award the purchase of picnic table frames from R.J. Thomas Mfg. Co. for \$22,056**

Purchasing Manager Rick Jensen explained that this went out for bid with two options – one for completely assembled picnic tables with delivery and one for just the frames disassembled with the idea that Park staff would assemble them. The fully-assembled frames would cost \$510 each. The disassembled frames came in at \$183.80 each. We had a sample sent to the Park Shop. Staff assembled it. It met all of our specifications, and we believe the City can save a lot of money by buying them unassembled.

Staff added that the total cost per table with the table frames purchased from this vendor and the City purchasing the recycled lumber slats separately will be approximately \$285.

A motion was made by Ald. Nennig and seconded by Ald. Moore to approve the award to purchase picnic table frames from R.J. Thomas Mfg. Co. for \$22,056. Motion carried.

**B. Request approval to award the purchase of park shelter doors to LaForce Inc. for \$12,794**

R. Jensen said the recommendation is to award to the low bidder, LaForce Inc.

Ald. Moore asked if this included installation. Staff replied no. Park staff will complete the installation.

Staff added this is our standard door that has been used throughout the parks.

A motion was made by Ald. Nennig and seconded by Ald. Moore to approve the award to purchase park shelter doors from LaForce Inc. for \$12,794. Motion carried.

**4. Director's Report**

Regarding the Astor Park shelter, the architect has finalized the building concept and site plan. Work has begun on the final bid documents. The final concept was reviewed with the Astor and Astor East River Neighborhood Associations on December 2, 2015.

Regarding the Atkinson Wall, the contractor did not complete the project this fall. Staff will work with the Purchasing Department to determine if this project will have to be requoted for spring construction or if we can continue to work with the selected contractor.

The Bay Beach west-end parking lot is completed. Staff is now developing a landscape plan for it.

Baird Place walkway replacement is completed. We also replaced the curb ramps and light fixtures with brighter LEDs.

The new bike racks along the Fox River Trail have been installed.

Tank Park splash pad is completed and will be open to the public in 2016.

Hopefully if all goes well, we will release "Reggie", the snowy owl, on December 15, 2015, at 11:30 a.m. at Bay Beach Park. Reggie is quite the celebrity since being rescued from the Tiletown chimney. Tiletown is releasing an SOS IPA to celebrate the release. A percentage of the sale of the IPA will go to the Wildlife Sanctuary.

Lastly, the Parks Department and I would like to wish you and your families a very joyful and happy holiday season.

Ald. Moore asked what the timeframe was to begin construction on the Falling Star ride and if the other two new rides were ready. Staff replied the restoration of the Falling Star ride is occurring now. Construction will begin in 2016. The other two rides will be ready for the opening of Bay Beach next summer.

A motion was made by Ald. Danzinger and seconded by Ald. Moore to receive and place on file the Director's Report. Motion carried.

A motion was made by Ald. Moore and seconded by Ald. Nennig to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 7:03 p.m.